

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 4 and 6 – 7 are pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and further examination in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

In the outstanding Office Action, claim 3 was objected to due to a grammatical informality; claims 1 and 4 – 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 5,671,670 to Takahashi et al. (hereinafter referred to as “the Takahashi et al. ‘670 reference”) in view of U.S. patent no. 5,911,527 to Aruga et al. (hereinafter referred to as “the Aruga et al. ‘527 reference”); claims 2 – 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Takahashi ‘670 reference in view of the Aruga ‘527 reference in further view of U.S. patent no. 6,095,040 to Ashikagaya et al. (hereinafter referred to as “the Ashikagaya et al. ‘040 reference”), U.S. patent no. 5,713,274 to Kawai et al. (hereinafter referred to as “the Kawai et al. ‘274 reference”), and U.S. patent no. 5,537,920 to Hasegawa et al. (hereinafter referred to as “the Hasegawa et al. ‘920 reference”); and claims 6 – 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 6,129,013 to Takasawa et al. (hereinafter referred to as “the Takasawa et al. ‘013 reference”) in view of the Aruga ‘527 reference.

By this response and amendment,

Claim 5 has been canceled;

claim 3 has been amended to change the phrase “ones of” to – one of –;

claims 1, 4 and 6 have been amended to recite a multi-color printing process performed when a plurality of printing drums is selected by a control section, a mono-color a printing process performed when a single printing drum is selected by a control section and a printing process

wherein, if the printing drum originally selected for the mono-color printing process is in an error state, a mono-color printing process is continued by a second printing drum; and

claim 7 was amended to recite performance of a multi-color printing process when a plurality of printing drums is selected and to further recite the performance of a mono-color printing process when a single printing drum is selected.

It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments do not introduce any new matter within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §132.

Objection to claim 3

The Examiner rejected to claim 3 because of a grammatical informality.

Response

By this Response and Amendment, Applicant has amended claim 3 to change the phrase: “ones of” to “one of”. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection to claim 3.

Rejection of Claims 1 and 4-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1 and 4 – 5 have been rejected 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Takahashi et al. ‘670 reference in view of the Aruga et al. ‘527 reference.

Response

By this Response and Amendment, claim 5 has been canceled, thereby rendering the Examiner’s rejection thereto moot.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 1 and 4 as amended. The cited references do not teach or suggest applicant's inventive subject matter as a whole as recited in amended claims 1 and 4.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must satisfy three requirements. First, the prior art relied upon, coupled with the knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference. *In re Fine*, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Second, the proposed modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made. *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharm. Co.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Lastly, the prior art references must teach or suggest all the limitations of the claims. *In re Wilson*, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970).

Amended claims 1 and 4 recite a stencil printing machine that comprises a plurality of printing drums adapted to print on a same print paper. The printing machine of the present invention as claimed is configured such that when a plurality of printing drums are selected, a multi-color printing process is performed; and when any single printing drum is selected, a mono-color printing process is performed by the selected printing drum. Amended claims 1 and 4 further recite the performance of a mono-color printing process by another printing drum when the drum originally selected for the mono-color printing process is in an error state. With respect to the *multi-color printing process*, the Takahashi et al. '670 reference does not disclose a plurality of printing drums that perform a multi-color printing process. Therefore, for at least this reason, the present invention is patentable over the Takahashi et al. 670 reference.

The Aruga et al. '527 reference does not remedy this deficiency. The Aruga et al. '527 reference discloses a hybrid printing device having a dot printing mechanism and a thermal printing mechanism wherein when an error is detected with either mechanism, the other printing mechanism can perform a task originally assigned to a first printing mechanism. However, as with the Takahashi et al. '670 reference, the Aruga et al. '527 reference does not disclose a plurality of printing drums that perform a multi-color printing process even when one of the originally selected printing drums is in an error state.

Therefore, as neither the primary reference nor the secondary reference teaches or suggests all of the limitations of claims 1 and 4 individually or in combination with each other, the cited prior art does not render claims 1 and 4 as amended obvious. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1 and 4.

Rejection of Claims 2 – 3 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2 – 3 were rejected as being unpatentable over the Takahashi et al. '670 reference in view of the Aruga et al. '527 reference in further view of the Ashikagaya et al. '040 reference, the Kawai et al. '274 reference, and the Hasegawa et al. '920 reference.

Response

The arguments above with respect to the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 are herein incorporated by reference. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 2-3. Because Applicant has successfully distinguished the presently claimed invention over the Hasegawa et al. '920 and Aruga et al. '527 references above, thereby placing claims 1 and 4 in condition for allowance, and because claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1, Applicant has therefore also

successfully placed claims 2 and 3 in condition for allowance. Neither the primary reference nor the secondary reference teach or suggest the novel limitations recited in amended claim 1 individually or in combination with each other.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 2-3.

Rejection of Claims 6 – 7 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 6 – 7 as being unpatentable over the Takasawa et al. '013 reference in view of the Aruga et al. '527 reference.

Response

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 6 and 7 as amended. The cited references do not teach or suggest applicant's inventive subject matter as a whole as recited in amended claims 6 and 7.

Amended claim 6 recites a stencil printing machine that comprises a plurality of printing drums adapted to print on a same print paper. The printing machine of the present invention as claimed includes an operation panel through which a user can select *one of one printing drum and the plurality of printing drums* to be used in the stencil printing process. Amended claim 6 further recites the performance of a mono-color printing process by another printing drum when the drum originally selected for the mono-color printing process is in an error state. Claim 7 was amended to recite performance of a multi-color printing process wherein *one of one printing drum and the plurality of printing drums* can be selected by a user.

The Takasawa et al. '013 reference shows a stencil printing machine having multiple ink drums; however, at column 25, lines 4 – 5, the Takasawa et al. '013 reference discloses drum select keys for selecting *one* of the ink drums . However, the Takasawa et al. '013 reference does not disclose a stencil printing machine having an operation panel wherein *a plurality* of ink drums can be selected by a user to perform a print process.

The Aruga et al. '527 reference does not remedy this deficiency. This reference teaches selection of a printing mechanism based on the data rather than user selection of a plurality of printing mechanisms.

As neither the primary nor the secondary reference teaches or suggests all of the limitations of amended claims 6 and 7 individually or in combination with each other, the cited prior art does not render obvious claims 6 and 7 as amended. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 6 and 7.


CONCLUSION

Based upon the above remarks, the presently claimed subject matter is believed to be novel and patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of pending claims 1 – 4 and 6 – 7.

The Examiner is welcomed to telephone the undersigned attorney if she has any questions or comments.

Respectfully submitted,
NATH & ASSOCIATES PLLC

Date: February 19, 2004
NATH & ASSOCIATES PLLC
1030 Fifteenth Street, N.W.
Sixth Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Tel: (202) 775-8383
Fax: (202) 775-8396
GMN/MCB/DR

By: 

Gary M. Nath
Reg. No. 26,965
Marvin C. Berkowitz
Reg. No. 47,421
Derek Richmond
Registration No. 45,771
Customer No. 20529